1. Introduction

A central issue in recent work is the question to what extent functional structure is relevant or crucial with respect to the interpretation of lexical elements, constituents, and constructions. In this article I will discuss the exclamative construction in Dutch, to which not much attention has been paid. This work is a part of a larger enterprise in which the organization of functional structure and the contribution of configurational properties to the interpretation of the clause are studied (cf. Bennis, to appear).

2. Where is the exclamation?

With respect to exclamative constructions, one of the major questions that we should raise is whether exclamation is lexically or structurally expressed. Which part of an exclamative phrase carries the exclamative force? Let us consider a typical exclamative sentence such as (1).

(1) Wat een mooie boeken staan er in die kast!

‘What a lot of beautiful books there are in that bookcase!’

There are at least three available candidates for expressing exclamation. It might be the [+wh]-pronoun \textit{wat}. In order to make that work, we have to assume that \textit{wat} is lexically specified as being exclamative. Another option is that \textit{een} is lexically specified as exclamative (cf. Droste 1970). We may also take the configuration to express exclamativity. Let us consider these alternative views in turn.

An argument in favour of the idea that \textit{wat} is exclamative is the fact that sentences introduced by \textit{wat} alone may be interpreted as exclamations. Examples are given in (2).
(2)  a. Wat heeft hij gewerkt!
   what has he worked
   ‘Boy, has he worked!’

   b. Wat staan er (een) mooie boeken in die kast!
   what stand there a beautiful books in that bookcase
   ‘What a lot of beautiful books there are in that bookcase!’

However, as argued in Bennis (1995) and Bennis et al. (1998), the exclamative use of the pronoun *wat* is the result of the interaction between the occurrence of the lexically underspecified item *wat* and the configuration in which *wat* appears (see also Postma 1995). The exclamative interpretation is not due to lexical properties of *wat*. It appears to be the case that the configuration determines whether a particular occurrence of *wat* is interpreted as either exclamative, interrogative or indefinite. This is shown in (3).

(3)  a. Wat heeft hij gezegd?
   what has he said
   ‘What did he say?’

   b. Hij heeft wat gezegd/gewerkt.
   he has what said/worked
   ‘He said something.’/
   ‘He worked a little bit.’

In (3a) we observe that *wat* is interpreted as interrogative if it is preposed and related to an A-position. The contrast between exclamative *wat* in (2) and interrogative *wat* in (3a) is fully determined by the question whether *wat* is the expression of an argument (interrogative) or not (exclamative). As demonstrated in (3b), non-preposed *wat* is interpreted as an indefinite pronoun, whether it is an argument or not. If indeed the configuration determines the interpretation of *wat*, it follows that an optimal analysis of this pronoun takes the configuration to convey quantificational aspects of meaning. It thus would be unattractive to take *wat* to be inherently exclamative in (1) or (2). Such a view is corroborated by the observation that in more complex DP-constructions *wat* appears with the same three quantificational interpretations. In addition to the exclamative *wat een N* construction in (1), we also find the interrogative *wat voor (een) N* construction, as in (4a), and the indefinite *wat N* construction in (4b).

(4)  a. Wat voor (een) mooie boeken staan er in die kast?
   what for a beautiful books stand there in that bookcase
   ‘What kind of beautiful books are there in that bookcase?’

   b. Er staan wat boeken in die kast.
   there stand what books in that bookcase
   ‘There are some books in that bookcase.’
Again we observe that the construction — in this case the internal structure of the DP — determines the interpretation of *wat*. From this we may conclude that it is not *wat* itself that is the exclamative element in (1). Another argument to discard *wat* as the exclamative marker is that we find exclamative DPs without *wat*, as in (5) below.

A second candidate that might be held responsible for the exclamative interpretation of (1) is *een*. Although *een* is normally assumed to be a singular indefinite determiner, it is demonstrably not a singular determiner in (1). As is shown in (5), *een* appears in construction with plural and non-count noun phrases in exclamative constructions.

(5)  

a. Er staan in die kast *een mooie boeken!*
   there stand in that bookcase a  beautiful books
   ‘What a lot of beautiful books there are in that cupboard!’

   b. Er ligt daar *een rommel/een zand op de grond!*
   there lies there a  rubbish/a  sand on the floor
   ‘What a lot of rubbish/sand there is on the floor!’

An argument in favour of the assumption that this so-called ‘spurious’ *een* (cf. Bennis et al. 1998) is the element with exclamative force, is the fact that it obligatorily appears in the *wat*-exclamatives in (6).

(6)  

a. Wat *(een) boeken heeft hij gekocht!*
   what a books has he bought
   ‘What a lot of books he bought!’

   b. Wat *(een) zand/rommel ligt er op de vloer!*
   what a sand/mess lies there on the floor
   ‘What a lot of sand/rubbish there is on the floor!’

As observed in relation to (2a), exclamative *wat* may appear alone, i.e., without a corresponding DP that contains *een*. It follows that exclamation occurs without *een* being present. We thus cannot take *een* to be the only exclamative formative. However, we may hypothesize that complex exclamative DPs always require *een* to be present.

It is not attractive to take the element *een* to be lexically specified as [+excl] given that it shows up in a variety of other constructions as well. First of all, it appears as the indefinite, singular determiner; but even if we restrict our attention to the spurious *een* which is not specified for being [+sing], it occurs in different construction types. In addition to the exclamative construction we can find spurious *een* in the *N-van-een-N* construction in (7a) and the *wat voor*-construction in (7b). A detailed discussion of these cases can be found in Bennis et al. (1998).
Although *een* is not lexically marked as exclamative, I will assume that exclamative DPs are characterized by the presence of *een*. This can be achieved by taking *een* to be an underspecified head that lexicalizes a position that is marked for exclamation.

There is an immediate problem with the hypothesis that exclamative DPs feature the presence of spurious *een* since it appears to be the case that exclamative DPs may occur without *een*, as is demonstrated in (8).

(8) a. Wat staan er in die kast toch mooie boeken! (cf. 5a/6a)
   ‘What a lot of beautiful books there are in that cupboard!’

b. Wat maakt hij toch rommel! (cf. 5b/6b)
   ‘What a mess he makes!’

These sentences seem to contain *een*-less exclamative DPs. The picture that emerges is that *een* is obligatory if *wat* is DP-internal (cf. 6), but optional in split *wat* exclamatives (cf. 2b; 8). Below I will argue that the sentences in (8) do not contain exclamative DPs. Rather these sentences instantiate another type of exclamation in which the exclamative operator has sentential scope.

### 3. Split *wat* exclamatives

It has often been suggested that in constructions such as (9a) *wat* has been extracted from the exclamative DP, in the same way as extraction takes place from the interrogative *wat voor* constituent, as in (9b). However, as has been argued for by Krijgsman (1982) and Corver (1990), an alternative analysis without movement from DP is available. This analysis is represented in (9c).

(9) a. Wat, heeft hij [*t₁ een mooie boeken*] gekocht!
   ‘What has he a beautiful books bought’

b. Wat, heeft hij [*t₁ voor een mooie boeken*] gekocht?
   ‘What kind of beautiful books did he buy?’

c. Wat, heeft hij [*een mooie boeken*], gekocht!
In the first analysis *wat* is an exclamative element that originates within the DP and moves to Spec,CP with or without pied piping of the DP. In the analysis represented in (9c) *wat* is an exclamative operator that occupies the scope position, and that is related to the exclamative DP at the level of LF. The first analysis is similar to the standard analysis of *wat*-extraction in the case of *wat* *voor* DPs. The second analysis is to some extent reminiscent of the analysis of partial *wh*-movement in non-standard variants of Dutch and German (cf. McDaniel 1989). An example is given in (10).

(10)  
?Wat denk je wie hij gezoend heeft?  
what think you who he kissed has  
‘Who do you think he kissed?’

In (9c) and (10) *wat* occupies an operator position that marks the scope of the exclamative or interrogative constituent. Given the fact that *wat* may be a simplex operator without a corresponding exclamative DP anyway, as in sentences such as (2a), the *wat*-operator analysis of (9c) is to be preferred.

Moreover, Corver (1990) provides a number of arguments that support the idea that such a non-movement analysis of ‘split-exclamatives’ must be available. He does so by showing that there are contrasts in distribution between [*wat* ... *een*]-exclamatives and [*wat* ... *voor*]-interrogatives. I will repeat one of his arguments here. Corver argues that split exclamatives have a wider distribution than split interrogatives. If both constructions have to be analysed as the result of *wat*-movement, it would be hard to account for the fact that split interrogatives obey conditions on extraction from PP-arguments, PP-adjuncts, and subjects, and do not allow multiple extraction, whereas these movements give acceptable results in the case of split exclamatives. The case of PP-arguments is illustrated in (11).

(11)  
a. Wat woon jij in [een rotstad]!  
what live you in a lousy-town  
‘What a lousy town you live in!’

b. *Wat woon jij in [voor een dorp]?  
what live you in for a village

The contrast in (11) can be explained quite easily if we assume that *wat* does not originate within the exclamative DP in (11a). In order to show that the sentences in (8) do not feature an exclamative DP — that *een*-less DPs are not exclamative — we have to go one step further. Not only do we have to show that *wat* may be a separate operator that does not originate within DP. We also have to argue that *wat* cannot be moved from DP. If it can be demonstrated that the presence of *wat* in (11a) must be an instance
of an operator base-generated in Spec,CP, there is no reason whatsoever to analyse the *een-less DPs in (8) as inherently exclamative.

The data in (12) are the opposite of the data in (11). In these cases movement of *wat out of the interrogative *wat voor construction is acceptable, whereas the relation between *wat and an exclamative DP is blocked (cf. Krijgsman 1982:150, Corver 1990:119).

(12) a. *Wat, zei hij dat er [een mooie boeken], in de kast staan!
what said he that there a beautiful books in the bookcase stand
b. [Wat een mooie boeken], zei hij dat er *t, in de kast staan!
what a beautiful books said he that there in the bookcase stand
‘What a beautiful books he said there are in the bookcase!’
c. Wat, zei hij dat er *[t voor een mooie boeken], in de kast staan?
what said he that there for a beautiful books in the bookcase stand
‘What kind of beautiful books did he say there are in the bookcase?’

These sentences demonstrate two contrasts. The acceptability of (12b) indicates that exclamative DPs with DP-internal *wat can be moved from an embedded clause. The ungrammaticality of (12a) would be hard to explain if it would involve *wh-movement from the exclamative DP. If (12a) contains a base-generated exclamative scope marker in the matrix clause, the interpretive relation between *wat in the matrix and the *een-DP in the embedded clause involves a locality violation. The contrast between (12a) and (12c) receives a similar explanation. (12c) is a case of long movement. As in (12b), there is no violation of locality constraints, due to the fact that *wh-movement may proceed through successive cyclic movement. These data show that no movement analysis of split *wat exclamatives is available.

A similar argument comes from differences between Dutch and English. Although English has an exclamative construction that is rather similar to the non-split *wat-exclamative, there is no split variant. This is shown in (13).4

(13) a. What a fool he is!
b. *What he is a fool!

The same is true for exclamative or interrogative adjectival phrases introduced by *how, as in (14) and (15).

(14) a. How foolish he is!
   (15) a. How foolish is he?
b. *How he is foolish!
   b. *How is he foolish?

The data in (13)–(15) are generally taken to instantiate illicit left-branch extraction. Whatever the roots are of the ban on left-branch extraction, we see in (16)
that there is no difference between Dutch and English with respect to how/hoe-extraction. Dutch observes the left branch condition as well.

(16) a. Hoe stom is hij? (=15a)
   b. *Hoe is hij stom? (=15b)

Interestingly, splitting the adjective and the wh-element appears to be possible in exclamative AP-constructions, but only if the wh-element is wat. This is shown in (17) and (18).

(17) a. Wat stom is hij!
   what foolish is he
   b. Wat is hij stom!
   what is he foolish

(18) a. Hoe bijzonder is het dat hij komt!
   how special is it that he comes
   b. *Hoe is het bijzonder dat hij komt!
   how is it special that he comes

These contrasts suggest that it is Dutch wat that renders ‘splitting’ possible. The way in which wat differs from hoe and from English how and what is that wat in Dutch may appear as an exclamation operator by itself.

A final observation concerns a case in which we find a wh-phrase different from wat that precedes exclamative een, as in the somewhat marked example in (19a). The split variant of (19a) is completely unacceptable.

(19) a. *Welk een vooruitzichten heeft hij niet!
   which a perspectives has he not
   ‘What prospects he has!’
   b. *Welk heeft hij niet een vooruitzichten!

This demonstrates that there is no wh-movement from within an exclamative DP. The so-called split exclamatives involve a separate exclamation operator wat which may be related to an exclamative phrase interpretively. This analysis allows us to maintain the generalization that exclamative DPs are characterized by the presence of spurious een.

4. Exclamative clauses

Now that we have determined the form of exclamative DP such as [(wat) een NP], we should raise the question whether exclamative CPs can also be
characterized in a uniform way. One look in a descriptive grammar (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Paardekooper 1986) makes it clear that there exists a bewildering number of different ways to express exclamation. Exclamation can be expressed in the form of main or subordinate clauses. Starting with main clauses, we find subject initial (20), verb initial (21), or topic initial (22) exclamative clauses. As a subcase of (20) and (22), we find main clauses introduced by the exclamative operator *wat* (23), or by an exclamative (*wat* *een*-*DP*) (24).

(20) *Hij heeft me toch (een) mooie boeken gekocht!*  
he has me PRT a beautiful books bought  
‘Boy, has he bought a lot of beautiful books!’  

(21) *Heeft hij me toch (een) mooie boeken gekocht!*  
has he me PRT a beautiful books bought  
‘Boy, has he bought a lot of beautiful books!’  

(22) *In die kast staan er toch (een) mooie boeken!*  
in that bookcase stand there PRT a beautiful books  
‘What a lot of beautiful books there are in that bookcase!’  

(23) *Wat staan er in die kast (een) mooie boeken!*  
what stand there in that bookcase PRT a beautiful books  
‘What a lot of beautiful books there are in that bookcase!’  

(24) *Wat een mooie boeken staan er in die kast!*  
what a beautiful books stand there in that bookcase  
‘What a lot of beautiful books there are in that bookcase!’

As before, the question arises what causes these sentences to become exclamations. In the sentences in (23) and (24) this is quite clear. An exclamative DP with *een* and/or the exclamative operator *wat* is present to indicate exclamative force. In (20)–(22) exclamation is brought about by using exclamative particles, such as *me, toch, me toch*, etc. I suggest that in these cases the particles function as the lexicalisation of the exclamative operator. This analysis is supported by the fact that the particles have to precede an exclamative DP, and by the fact that the distance between the particles and the exclamative phrase is subject to locality constraints, as is shown in (25). In this respect these particles behave similarly to the exclamation operator *wat* in (26).
(25) a. Het is me opgevallen dat Jan *me toch [een mooie boeken] heeft!
   it has me struck that John PRT PRT a beautiful books has
   ‘It struck me that John has such a lot of beautiful books!’
   b. *Het is *me toch opgevallen dat Jan [een mooie boeken] heeft!

(26) a. Het is me opgevallen wat Jan [een mooie boeken] heeft!
   it has me struck what John a beautiful books has
   ‘It struck me that John has such a lot of beautiful books!’
   b. *Wat is jou opgevallen dat Jan [een mooie boeken] heeft!

Although all the sentences in (20)–(24) appear to involve an exclamative operator and an exclamative variable, the question remains why there are so many different ways to express exclamation. Let us investigate what the differences are. If the sentences contain an exclamative DP, i.e., a DP with spurious *een, the DP functions as the variable. The operator might be either at the edge of VP in the case of the exclamative particles, in Spec,CP in the case of simplex *wat, or in Spec,DP in the case of *[wat een NP]-constructions. There are no clear interpretive differences between these cases. If *een is not present — i.e., there is no inherently exclamative DP — the DP doesn’t have to be in the scope of the exclamation operator. This is shown in (27).

(27) a. Hij heeft me toch snel een paar boterhammen met pindakaas gegeten!
   he has PRT PRT fast a few slices-of-bread with peanut butter eaten
   ‘Boy, has he eaten a few slices of bread with peanut butter very fast!’
   b. Wat heeft hij snel boterhammen met pindakaas gegeten!
   what has he fast slices-of-bread with peanut. butter eaten

In the sentences in (27) the DP *boterhammen met pindakaas does not have to be the object of exclamation. It might just as well be *snel or the whole VP. The difference with sentences with *een-DPs is the consequence of the fact that spurious *een forces the DP to be exclamative, or rather, forces the DP to be in the scope of an exclamation operator. The V2 sentences with particle operators — (20) and (22) — do not differ, other than that (22) is a sentence with topicalisation.

The remaining question is why there is a possibility to express exclamation in a V1 sentence, as in (21). In non-exclamatives, V1 sentences can be of three different types. These sentences show up as *yes/no questions, in the case of topic-drop, and in the case of so-called narrative V1. Although the distinction with V2 exclamatives is rather subtle, it seems to be the case these V1–exclamatives receive an interpretation in which a presupposition from the preceding discourse is either confirmed or denied. If the discourse provides a situation in which someone went to a bookshop to buy books, one may utter the exclamative clause in (21) to confirm that indeed he bought beautiful books. The presupposition
may also entail that he wouldn’t be able to buy beautiful books. In such a situation (21) is used to negate the discourse presupposition. It thus seems to be the case that the V1–exclamative is the exclamative variant of the yes/no-question. From this we may conclude that the generally adopted assumption that V1 is a configuration in which the Spec,CP is occupied by an abstract interrogative operator must be wrong. If we do not take into account topic drop and narrative V1, which both arguably have an empty element in first position, V1 is a configurational indication that polarity is involved. This polarity gives rise to either a yes/no question or a yes/no exclamative.

A second set of exclamative clauses consists of sentences that are introduced by complementizers. Although these sentence have the form of embedded clauses, they occur as main clauses with exclamative force. Examples are given in (28) and (29).

(28) Dat hij die boeken kan lezen!
    that he those books can read
    ‘Wow, he can read those books!’

(29) En of hij die boeken kan lezen!
    and whether he those books can read
    ‘He CAN certainly read those books!’

In these cases the scope of exclamation is different from the main clause exclamatives. Whereas main clause exclamatives may have specific constituents or the event in the scope of the exclamative operator, in (28) and (29) the whole proposition is the object of exclamation. By uttering (28) one exclaims about the assertion that the subject hij is able to read those books. The difference between (28) and (29) is parallel to the difference between (20) and (21). (29) is uttered to deny or confirm the whole proposition. If the discourse contains the presupposition that he is not able to read those books, (29) can be used to deny this proposition. The opposite is possible as well. If the discourse presupposes that he is able to read those books, (29) may be used to strengthen this presupposition. Just as (21), the sentence in (29) receives a polar interpretation. This throws light on the meaning of the grammatical formative of. It is generally assumed that of is either an interrogative complementizer introducing embedded questions (‘whether’) or a disjunctive coordination marker (‘or’). In the example above it is neither. However, the polarity interpretation that is associated with (29) can be extended to cover the other interpretations of of. It is rather obvious that polarity is involved in yes/no questions. From this perspective it is easy to understand that of is used in disjunctions as well. The fact that the interpretation of of is more abstract than generally assumed, has the advantage that we can understand
some of the factors that determine its occurrence. In (30) we observe that a positive matrix clause forces the complementizer to be that, whereas a matrix negation allows the complementizer to be of.

(30) a. Ik herinner mij dat/*of Jan dat durft.
    I remember me that/*whether John that dares

    b. Ik herinner mij niet dat/* of Jan dat durft.
    I remember me not that/whether John that dares
    ‘I don’t remember whether John dares to do that.’

If one remembers a proposition, this proposition is assumed to be true. If one does not remember it, the proposition may or may not be true. If one utters (30b) with that as a complementizer, one implies that the proposition is true although one isn’t able to remember it. If one utters (30b) with of as a complementizer, the implication is that the truth of the embedded proposition is left open. This corroborates the idea that of is a polarity element.7

An interesting consequence of the analysis of exclamatives sentences introduced by a complementizer developed so far is that we predict that exclamative DPs may not occur in these sentences. The reason being that in these exclamatives the proposition is the object of exclamation as a whole. Exclamative DPs require to be the object of exclamation as well, which would lead to an incompatibility that might be formalized as an i-within-i violation at the LF-interface. That this prediction is confirmed is illustrated in (31).

(31) a. *Dat hij een boeken heeft gelezen!
    that he a books has read

    b. *En of hij een boeken heeft gelezen!
    and whether he a books has read

A final set of exclamative clauses concerns the exclamatives introduced by complementizers in which one constituent precedes the complementizer, as in (32) and (33).8

(32) a. Leuk dat dat feestje was!
    nice that that party was
    ‘Wasn’t that party nice!’

    b. (Een) mooie boeken dat Jan heeft gelezen!
    a beautiful books that John has read
    ‘What a lot of beautiful books John has read!’

(33) a. Wat een problemen (’of) je kunt krijgen met zo’n auto!
    what a problems whether you can get with such a car
    ‘What a lot of problems you can get with such a car!’
b. Wat (¿of) je een problemen kunt krijgen met zo’n auto! what whether you a problems can get with such a car ‘What a lot of problems you can get with such a car!’
c. Wie (¿of) hij niet heeft uitgenodigd voor dat feest! who whether he not has invited for that party ‘Whomever he hasn’t invited to that party!’

The difference between (32) and (33) is that the dat-exclamatives in (32) can only be preceded by non-wh-constituents, whereas the of-exclamatives in (33) can be preceded by wh-phrases only. Interpretively these sentences imply that the constituent that is preposed to the pre-complementizer position is the constituent that is in the scope of exclamation. It thus follows that exclamative een-DPs may appear in this construction if this constituent occupies the pre-C-position, as in (32b) and (33a), or if the pre-C-position is occupied by the exclamative operator wat, as in (33b). If the exclamative DP does not occur in pre-C-position or is not related to the wat operator in pre-C-position, the sentences are just as ungrammatical as the examples in (31). This is illustrated in (34).

(34) a. Leuk dat hij (*een) boeken heeft gelezen! nice that he a books has read ‘How nice it is that he reads books!’
    b. Wie of hij niet (*een) boeken heeft gegeven! who whether he not a books has given ‘What a lot of people he has given books to!’

These examples demonstrate that in contrast with topicalization in V2 clauses (cf. 22), the topicalization in (32)/(33) is intended to bring a constituent in the scope of exclamation.

5. Conclusion

The discussion of the exclamative construction is intended to show that the extremely wide variety of exclamative constructions can be understood if we allow ourselves to take a more abstract position with respect to functional elements and grammatical morphemes. I have argued that exclamative DPs feature spurious een. This grammatical morpheme is not lexically specified as being exclamative. DP-exclamation is the interaction between configurational properties and underspecified lexical items, such as wat and een. The same holds for sentential exclamation. In main clauses an exclamative operator has to be present to bring about the exclamative force. This operator may be wat or an
exclamative particle. In sentences introduced by a complementizer, the complementizer functions as the exclamation operator. Again, not by being lexically specified as such, but as a combination of configuration and lexical underspecification. This was particularly clear in the case of of. A careful study of this interaction allows us to understand the different interpretive properties of the various constructions that have been under discussion here. In forthcoming work I hope to be able to present a more detailed theoretical account of this interesting set of data.

Notes

1. In this example and in the examples below I translate the exclamation as quantification over the amount of members that belong to the set described by the NP, in this case the high amount of beautiful books. However, the exclamation may also quantify over qualitative properties of the relevant set. The example in (1) is ambiguous between the quantitative reading given in (1) and a qualitative reading in which the exclamation quantifies over the high degree of beauty of the relevant set of books. Although I think this difference is important for a proper understanding of the nature of quantification that is involved in these construction, I will leave this topic out of consideration here, for reasons of space.

2. Partial wh-movement shows up in child language as well, as has been observed in e.g. Van Kampen (1997).

3. The difference between a relation established through movement (before spell-out), as in the case of split interrogatives, and a relation through interpretive processes (possibly movement after spell-out), is also visible with other interpretive processes. For instance, in the case of argument PPs, the prepositional object cannot be extracted, but this object might be related to PP-external constituents through interpretation, as in the case of Binding, in negative polarity, or in quantifier scope.

4. This argument was part of an early version of Bennis et al. (1998), but has been left out for reasons of space.

5. For the internal structure of exclamative DPs and other complex DPs featuring spurious een, I refer the reader to Bennis et al. (1998).

6. As a reviewer observes, the exclamative particles may appear in combination with the exclamative operator wat. In order to prevent the situation in which vacuous quantification of wat arises as a consequence of the fact that the particle binds the exclamative DP, I have to assume that exclamative particles are not necessarily interpreted as operators. They may also be interpreted as elements that emphasize the quantification relation between wat and the (exclamative) DP.

7. The fact that of is a polarity element is confirmed by the fact that it licenses negative polarity items (cf. van der Wouden 1994), as in (i).

(i) Niemand herinnert zich of/*dat Jan dat hoeft te doen.
   nobody remembers SELF whether/that John that needs[NEG.POL] to do
The fact that of is the relevant factor in the licensing of the negative polarity verb *hoeven* ('to need'), supports an analysis along the lines described above.

8. There is one additional exclamative construction in which the preposed constituent is not followed by a complementizer, but rather by a relative pronoun. It concerns exclamatives such as *Gek die je bent! (fool who you are)* For reasons of space I will leave this construction out of consideration here.
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